

UNCLASSIFIED

Note To: Ed Maloney

From:

Subject: DOS

Ed, the attached is a proposed implementation of the DOS (Decentralized Office Support) proposal. It is presented for senior OIT Management review. When required changes are made, it might be used as a basis for negotiations with the DA offices. Note that the paper is not office specific; it would need to be tailored for each office as the implementation for each office will likely be different.

The paper was developed taking into account inputs from MISG managers and staff and selected rotational personnel. While the plan does not represent unanimity, it does represent the opinions of the majority.

As background to the plan and in preparation for any negotiations, you need to be aware of the thinking behind some major points. This discussion follows.

First and foremost, the numbers. The number and distribution of personnel in the proposal to the DD/A apparently were derived as a snapshot in time. In most cases we can reconstruct these numbers, in others we cannot. A more important issue, however, is what the numbers should be. We have rebuilt a recommended staffing table. To arrive at recommended numbers we considered all personnel on rotation, not just MISGers. We then proposed a number of maintenance type personnel sufficient to maintain the programs that would be transferred to each Office. To this we added a small number of MISG development programmers. The developer number was kept deliberately small because a large portion of the MISG DA development effort has already been shifted to Corporate or targeted at other Directorates and because rotation folks already do a large amount of DA development. The numbers we are proposing differ significantly from those in the memo to the DD/A and the Office Chiefs. We believe that the new numbers can be adequately defended. There is however a policy issue in the number of developers you wish to disperse. Numbers of maintenance personnel can be derived from experience on the projects and are not subject to much argument. Developers are bought by the pound - it is simply a question of affordability. To focus on affordability, we reintroduced a formula that has DA offices partially "paying" for DOS by putting up half the slots. If MISG puts up more than the recommended number of developer personnel or positions, existing and planned work will need to be slowed or stopped.

One of the advantages of DOS is to put a cap on ever upward-spiraling development requirements. We are concerned that as Corporate systems are developed centrally, replacing older systems being maintained under DOS, those maintenance resources will not be shifted back to OIT for central maintenance of the new corporate systems. While it is true that corporate maintenance can be "DOSed" in turn, the responsible office for

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

maintenance is less clear in corporate systems. This future problem argues for not being too generous now in giving up resources as needed flexibility to shift people may be lost.

In going through the DA offices and discussing levels of effort, we came to the conclusion that DOS is probably inappropriate for OC, OMS, and OTE because of the small numbers involved. Rotations would probably serve those offices better along with a central MISG development capability. Maintenance requirements in these offices are relatively small; development is small (at least historically) and cyclic, thus better handled centrally. We felt that OS is a borderline case in that there is a moderate level of personnel involved. If OS wants to implement some of the recommendations in the OS study they will certainly need to be DOSed. There is a large amount of development work to be done in OS, but some question about resources being available. We noted that OL is essentially a DOS shop now. There we need to strengthen the ties back to MISG. Thus the DOS negotiations would really be between OIT and OF and OIT and OP. In OPs case we only anticipate a problem in the numbers involved. For whatever reason OP (i.e. [redacted]) is expecting larger numbers than we recommend. We anticipate strong disagreement from OF on just about every issue. We also feel that the DOS manager for OF should be a strong senior person and should be identified prior to the negotiations so as to have input to them.

There is considerable trepidation among the people likely to be "DOSed". We believe this is "start-up" concern and is a normal reaction to any change. We think the program once implemented will settle down. Because of this uneasiness, we feel strongly that the plan should be quickly implemented where appropriate - or dropped. We are already seeing the effects of personnel "job-jockeying" based on perceived notions of what and where DOS might be. Particularly in [redacted] maintenance shops, we must ensure strong, viable, qualified teams to maintain critical DA programs.

We have had many lengthy discussions concerning whether DOS would be more like the current rotation program or a "remote MISG branch" located on customer space. The result we came to is a hybrid. As you will note when reading the attached we think DOS is like a remote piece of MISG in that the DOS manager would sit on MISG career sub-panels and attend MISG staff meetings; DOS personnel would attend all technical and social functions; MISG would handle all assignments; DOS personnel coming back from a DOS shop would come back to MISG, etc. It is like the rotation program in that we did opt for a rotation agreement and MISG would not have the same degree of freedom in filling DOS slots as it does in filling internal slots.

Related to the above, we also felt that significant DOS projects would be required to adhere to MISG development standards, be subject to CM procedures, and would come under the scrutiny of the MISG CCB and ERB. The MISG CCB would have go/no go authority in the development cycle for selected DOS projects. Note however that MISG has no say in the initiation or the prioritization of DOS projects.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

We took exception (or clarified perhaps) two points in your memorandum to the Office Chiefs. You indicated that all Corporate development would be done centrally. We broke Corporate work into five areas: (1) Architecting and planning of the Corporate environment for the Agency; (2) Issuance and enforcement of standards, procedures and guidelines for project development in the IDMS/R environment; (3) Provision of Data Base Administration support to IDMS/R projects; (4) Maintenance of the IDMS/R Integrated Data Dictionary; and (5) Corporate systems development. The first four must be performed centrally. The last, corporate development, we said will, on a project-by-project basis be either developed centrally or in a customer office. We do not feel we have either the resources or the political clout to do all development centrally.

By the same reasoning we noted that field computing is really three things (at least): (1) architecting, planning and providing the network connecting field locations to headquarters and to each other; (2) architecting, planning and providing the configurations of hardware and system software at a site; and (3) the development of field systems. Again we noted that the first two must be performed centrally while the third, development, would be negotiated; OIT will do some of the development, customers and other Offices will do some. The rationale is the same as Corporate above. Note for purposes of this DOS discussion we have ignored other players in the field computing arena such as OC or IMS who would surely have something to say about responsibilities in this arena. The main point is that for both Corporate and Field Computing we are simply saying that OIT cannot possibly do all the development itself. It is neither appropriate or practical.

We strongly endorsed the concept of a single DOS team in each customer office reporting to a high level in the office. You should be aware that the informal feedback we get from OF is that they would rather disperse the team, both managerially and physically into various parts of OF. OP feedback on the other hand supports the concept as defined.

We do not feel that OIT should always provide fully-qualified personnel to the DOS shops. Rather the DOS slots should reflect a mix of junior and senior positions so as to provide entry positions (probably into the maintenance jobs) of EOD-level people. We need to have a way of bringing in junior people and growing them. Today in MISG that is largely maintenance division. Under DOS we have to have the same flexibility. Obviously not all the maintenance jobs would be held by EODs. We simply need the flexibility to pipeline junior programmers. The maintenance activity remaining in MISG would also be used for this purpose.

One of the key advantages of DOS is locating personnel close to the customer. Because of this, we recommend that prior to starting a DOS shop in a customer office, that office should commit to providing the space and facilities for the people not more than 6 months from start. OIT should be assured that appropriate space will be made available in that time-frame before entering into the agreement. If that cannot be done, DOS for that office should be postponed and reconsidered later. We need to be very careful about the effects on our people and their work in creating ambiguous staffing and organizational relationships

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

that drag on for long periods of time.

Finally, one more persistent concern needs to be aired: what problems is DOS solving. The group felt that MISG failures of the past have not been in the maintenance arena but rather large systems development efforts. But if you examine the numbers (assuming we go with them), what is being DOSed is large numbers of maintenance people and a rather small development complement. The recommended number of developers is enough for small projects but certainly not projects the size of an ACIS or LIMS. We feel that the large programs will, after suitable negotiations for resources, be done centrally. Thus DOS' advantages (from OIT's perspective) seem to be two: (1) small, non-corporate development will be effectively resource capped; and (2) OIT will be the recipient of fewer barbs about these type projects and about maintenance work. In both areas as was said previously, that is what we do well already. It is likely that in terms of real work accomplished, DOS will have no effect, but that the relationship between OIT and its customer office will be better.

UNCLASSIFIED